



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,145	04/24/2000	TOSHIO YAMAWAKI	37395/DBP	5367

7590

12/31/2003

D BRUCE PROUT
CHRISTIE PARKER & HALE
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER

BOAKYE, ALEXANDER O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2667

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/530,145

Applicant(s)

YAMAWAKI, TOSHIO

Examiner

Alexander Boakye

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US Patent # 5,640,400) in view of Kawano et al. (US Patent # 5,933,605).

Regarding claims 10, 11, 15 and 16, Sato discloses a gateway device (column 9, line 44; see GW11 of Fig. 3) which interconnects two communication buses (see 11,12 of Fig. 3) implemented with different communication methods, and in which information to be communicated is made up of a header field (the claimed header field is inherent in the information which is well known in the art) containing information such as an address necessary for communication and message instruction message, to be used at receiving side after the communication based on the header field is completed , the gateway device (GW11, Fig. 3) comprising: Judging means for judging, based on contents of the message field , whether or not the information received from one communication bus is to information that should be transmitted to the other communication bus (column 10, lines 54-67).

Sato differs from the claimed invention in that Sato does not disclose filtering means. However, Kawano teaches filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other communication bus (column 14, lines 54-65). One of the

Art Unit: 2667

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate filtering means such as the one taught by Kawano in to the communication network of Sato in order to remove unwanted information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate filter means such as the one of Kawano into the communication network of Sato with the motivation being that it provides security and efficiency.

Regarding claims 12, 13, 17 and 18, Sato discloses a gateway device (column 9, line 44; see GW11 of Fig.3) which interconnects two communication buses (see 11, 12 of Fig. 3) the lines implemented with different communication methods, and in which information to be communicated is made up of a header field containing information such as an address necessary for communication and message field to be used at receiving side after the communication based on the header field is completed , the gateway device (column 9, line 44) comprising: Judging means for judging, whether or not the information received from one communication bus is to information that should be transmitted to the other communication bus (column 10, lines 54-67).

Sato does not disclose storage means for storing the information ; and filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other communication bus.

However, Kawano discloses storage means for storing the information (column 8, lines 13-18); and filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other communication bus (column 14, lines 54-65) when the received information is judged by the judging means to be the information that should be transmitted.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate a storage means for storing information and filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other bus into the gateway device in order to prevent congestion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a storage means for storing information and filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other bus such as the one taught by Kawano into the communication network of Sato with the motivation being that it provides security and avoidance of congestion.

Regarding claim 14, Sato teaches that the gateway device (column 9, line 44 ; see GW11, Fig. 3) interconnects two communication buses (11,12 , Fig. 3) in an automobile.

Regarding claims 19, 20, 21, 22, Sato discloses the gateway device (GW, Fig. 3), wherein the information is payload information (the claimed payload information is inherent in the information which is well known in the art).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Sato discloses that the header field includes information specifying a destination address (destination address is inherent in the header field which is well known in the art).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2667

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Boakye whose telephone number is (703) 308-9554. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham, can be reached on (703) 305-4378. The fax number is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Alexander Boakye

Patent Examiner

AB

12/22/03

KWANG BIN YAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

